

Twenty - Two Years in Parliament



Photo by Malak, Ottawa

BY W. "GIBB" WEIR, M.P.

Foreword

Parliament is really a great university, bringing together people from all walks of life and from all parts of Canada to meet with the representatives of Her Majesty, the statesmen and diplomats of our countries, the High Court Judges, the leaders of the fourth estate, the civil service and the man on the street.

Here combined, in one place, are most of those things that affect the lives of every person in this country. Here, the ambitions and aspirations of some are thwarted, while others gain further recognition and renown.

Having been associated with the life of our Capital for over twenty-two years I thought I might record, in a lighter vein, some of the more human and amusing incidents I have experienced both in Parliament and during elections.

Upon showing what I had gathered together to a friend he urged that I have it printed, to which I have finally yielded.

I realize it is limited and inadequate.

As they say on the screen, "Composed, edited and narrated by W. 'Gibb' Weir, M.P."

March, 1953.

CHAPTER 1

In 1919 our community organized a Grain Growers Association. The late Peter Wright and Andrew Graham, members of the district Association, came to our school house one evening to assist us in getting started. It was a dark night in the spring of the year. The roads were very heavy and they of course had to travel by team and buggy. Mr. Wright was the chief speaker. The fine old gentleman wore a celluloid collar, and much to his embarrassment one side of the collar slipped off the collar button when he was speaking, and all through his speech he was trying to catch this loose end and get it back into place. Our community, as indeed the school I attended, was known as Tobacco Creek, so named, we were told, by a group of land surveyors who were reported to have lost a caddy of chewing tobacco when crossing the creek.

Our local carried on successfully a number of activities for several years. I was, in turn, secretary, president and delegate to the provincial convention. It was at the provincial convention in 1922 that I had my first experience in meeting Members of Parliament and leaders of the Farm Movement. The convention was held in the old Board of Trade building in Winnipeg, and of course was long before my political baptism. I refer to that convention because it followed shortly after the entry of the Farm Movement into federal politics, and also because the old Board of Trade building had so many pillars holding up the ceiling that you could hardly see who was in front of you let alone those on the platform.

The Farm Movement had developed a broad liberal platform, with emphasis on freer trade, lower tariffs, lower freight rates, added railway facilities (including the completion of the Hudson Bay Railway), conservation, tax reform, improved credit facilities for agriculture, increased immigration, electoral reform (including votes for women), standardization of farm products and improved marketing. Its strength was in the hundreds of local farm associations all over Western Canada. It centralized its activities first in the provincial associations, whose annual meetings became known as the Farmers' Parliament and, secondly, in the Canadian Council of Agriculture, representing all the provincial associations as a national organization.

When the decision was made to enter federal politics the Council of Agriculture, under the guidance of Norman P. Lambert (now Senator Lambert), its then national secretary, directed the campaign. The Hon. T. A. Crerar, who was president of the United Grain Growers Ltd., and who had been a member of Sir Robert Borden's wartime government, was selected as leader of the movement. I can well remember some of the things Mr. Crerar said at a luncheon meeting he had with a group of us younger chaps at that convention. Apart from having a platform that may have appealed more strongly to Western Canada, the strength of the movement came from the local associations, to which adherents contributed \$5.00 towards the cost of that election.

In the 1921 federal election, the movement elected 65 members to the House of Commons who became known as "Progressives," and this was accomplished in spite of the unfounded charges made during the heat of the campaign that "false bottoms" had been found in the terminal elevators of the United Grain Growers. Mr. Crerar was president of the company. After the election, Mr. Crerar was chosen as leader of the parliamentary group which, incidentally, held the balance of power in that Parliament. He retired from the leadership of the group in 1923, and did not offer himself as a candidate in the elections of 1925 and 1926 but, instead, confined his activities to the presidency of the United Grain Growers. In 1929 Mr. King asked him to join his government as Minister

of Railways, and he was elected in a by-election in the constituency of Brandon, his place as leader of the group having been taken over by the Hon. Robert Forke, who had joined Mr. King's Government in 1926 as Minister of Immigration.

As a further evidence of the growth of the Farm Movement it won the election in Ontario in 1918, and Mr. E. C. Drury became Premier of the province. In Alberta it captured the province in 1919, with Mr. H. Greenfield becoming the Premier, later being replaced by J. E. Brownlee.

In 1922, the United Farmers of Manitoba (the name having been changed from that of the Manitoba Grain Growers Association) entered provincial politics and contested the election without a leader, and was returned as the largest group in the legislature. A few weeks later John Braeken, who only a year before had become president of the Agricultural College, accepted the leadership of the group and became premier of the province.

By the time of the 1932 provincial election, a move was under way to bring about a working arrangement between Mr. Braeken's followers and certain Liberals of the province. The outcome of the negotiations saw the Hon. J. S. McDiarmid and the Hon. E. A. McPherson join Mr. Braeken's Ministry. This arrangement continued through the election of 1936. In the election of that year several constituencies returned Social Credit Members, and Mr. Braeken immediately attempted to form a coalition non-partisan government. This, however, was not accomplished until 1940 when Mr. Braeken re-organized his Ministry by taking into the Government two Conservative Members in the persons of Erriek G. Willis and J. O. McLenaghan, and Norman Turnbull of the Social Credit Group. This move was interpreted by some as a move of forcing a national government at Ottawa. At a later re-organization, W. C. Miller and C. E. Greenlay, Conservatives, were added to the Ministry. Mr. Willis withdrew his support from the government in 1950, as did some of his followers. At the same time Mr. Willis resigned his portfolio, while Mr. Miller and Mr. Greenlay remained in the Government. Upon Mr. Braeken's retirement in 1942, the Hon. Stuart S. Garson was chosen leader of the Liberal Progressives and became Premier of the province and Provincial Treasurer. Mr. Garson resigned the premiership in 1948 to become federal Minister of Justice, being replaced by the Hon. Douglas L. Campbell.

CHAPTER 2

It is now over twenty-two years since I was first a candidate for election to the House of Commons. The question frequently asked is—"How did you come to get into politics? Was it by design or did it just happen?" In my case I guess it just happened. It is only fair to add, as already indicated, that when I left college in 1920, and until 1930, I had been fairly actively associated with the United Farmers in Manitoba, the Canadian Council of Agriculture, and was a director of the Manitoba Wheat Pool, from which position I resigned when I became a candidate in 1930. My predecessor in Macdonald constituency was the late W. J. Lovie, who was elected in 1921 and also in 1925 and 1926 as a "Progressive."

In 1930 the Liberals and Progressives in Macdonald constituency agreed to hold a joint convention to nominate one candidate. There were sixty-five delegates named from each group to attend the nominating convention. I had no

thought of being a candidate, and had done nothing to promote my own nomination, and was wholly unaware of the number of friends who had been working on my behalf, and for which I am profoundly grateful. Even on the day of the convention I was by no means certain that I would allow my name to stand. However, through the influence of an uncle, G. E. Mowbray, of Roland, and my dad, I did.

There were five candidates who stood for nomination—W. J. Lovie, "Scotty" Wood, Alfred Larson, A. M. Messner and myself. I was looked upon as being from the "Progressives." The Liberal delegates were seated on one side of the hall and the Progressives on the other. The final ballot was between A. M. Messner and myself, and strange as it may seem he drew 16 votes from the Progressive group and I received 16 from the Liberals, the result being that the final vote was a tie. The convention agreed to take a second ballot rather than have the chairman, who was F. M. Ferg, give the deciding vote, and I won or lost, whichever way you like to take it.

As a sequel to that vote I was told by at least a dozen people that they themselves either switched their own vote or they knew of someone who did. I have understood that there was a switch of only one vote but judging by the number of people who spoke to me later there should have been a change of at least a dozen votes in my favour.

Anyway I got the nomination, borrowed \$800.00 on my life insurance, commandeered the family car and struck out, and was finally elected by a majority of 499 votes. The Conservative candidate in that election was the late Jack Woods of Somerset. I continued to be a candidate in the elections of 1935, 1940 and 1945. During the 1946 redistribution the constituency of Macdonald disappeared. I had lost my constituency and intended returning to private life but in a moment of weakness yielded to an invitation to contest the newly-created constituency of Portage-Neepawa in 1949, and found myself again elected to the House of Commons.

A recital of the Farm Movement, or the promotion of political activities, would be wholly incomplete without a reference to the part played by women, as is indeed the case in most common endeavours. With the luncheons, dinners and teas that they so frequently provide, they bring not only a finer touch but added enjoyment to so many gatherings.

Their influence has, however, been in a much wider field. They had a long up-hill battle to secure the right to vote, and to be recognized as a person, with the right of appointment to the Senate. They only secured the franchise first in Manitoba in 1916, in part federally in 1917, and totally in 1918, and in Quebec in 1940. They early interested themselves in "dower" rights and in their citizenship when marrying a person of another country. They gave particular attention to the education, health and welfare of their families, in penal reform and in the treatment of inmates of institutions. They urged an honest description of foods and clothing, and demanded labour-saving devices for their homes.

Many expended much time and effort in bringing forward problems that were particularly theirs, until today the women of Canada have gained a status well approaching that of their men folk, and they have joined with them in bottering conditions common to all.

In public affairs they have a particular advantage in that they are closer to the every day problems of the home, and are thus able to bring to notice many matters that might otherwise be overlooked. In their clubs and smaller group meetings, as well as in the public forum, they can be of great assistance to anyone seeking public office, and Lord pity the candidate who overlooks them and fails to recognize that they make up one half the voters of our country.

Many years ago I made a speech to a Women's Organization, and being very businesslike they gave me a cheque for my expenses, which, of course, I was unable to accept. When I handed it back, the chairman reconvened the meeting and asked what they wished to do with the money. Thereupon a fine little lady near the back of the hall rose and said—"I move we place this money to the credit of our fund for the securing of better speakers."

CHAPTER 3

Conducting an election campaign on one's own behalf is very different to that of promoting the interest of someone else, and the novice has quite a time adjusting himself to it. One soon realizes that he cannot be elected by his own efforts, but instead must rely on the members of his organization and his friends, which I have always done, and to whom I am profoundly grateful. I am particularly indebted to Frank Ferg, of Glenboro, who has been the president of my organization and my campaign manager in all my elections, and who did more than anyone else to assure my election.

I had a little experience in 1930 which, under the circumstances, for a beginner, was to me a bit funny.

One day I drove into the yard of an influential farmer who was Reeve of the municipality. I was met at the gate by a gracious young lady wearing overalls, and the conversation between us went something like this:

"Is this where Mr. Therien lives?" I asked. "Yes," replied the young lady.

"Is he at home?" "No."

"Are you a member of the family?" "Yes, I am the baby in this family." she said.

Whereupon I pricked up my ears, and explained—"This is very interesting. My name is Weir. I am the candidate in this election, and my job right now is supposed to be going about kissing babies."

"Well," she replied with emphasis, "you are not going to kiss me," and with that she ran back through the trees and into the house. I stood there alone, too self-conscious to pursue, and quite satisfied in my own mind that I was not going to gain any support in that household.

The election of 1930 was held on July 28th, and in September of that year, we were called to a special session of Parliament to carry out one of Mr. Bennett's election promises, namely, that he would call Parliament and vote 20 million dollars to end unemployment. Mr. Bennett carried out his promise and Parliament voted the 20 million dollars, but unfortunately for him it did not end unemployment, the nightmare of which followed him all through the period that he was Prime Minister.

Mr. Bennett, it will be recalled, put a great deal of personal effort into the 1930 election campaign, and made a large number of definite and specific promises. There was his promise to vote the 20 million dollars for unemployment, to which I have already referred. Also that appeal to the Western farmers telling them that he would make the tariff work for them, his phrase being that he would "blast a way into the markets of the world, build up old markets and find new ones, etc. There will be no difficulty on that score, etc. etc."

The sequel to his campaign promises turned out to be one of the chief reasons for the defeat of his Government in 1935. Mr. King very shrewdly

listed each and every one of Mr. Bennett's pre-election promises, and took an early opportunity to put them on the record of Hansard, and from then on these promises, all nicely consolidated, became the main theme of every Liberal Member's speech either in the House of Commons or in the country.

While Mr. Bennett had been elected with a comfortable majority, his number of "first line troops" was rather limited, and Mr. Bennett completely dominated not only his Government but also the House of Commons. He had with him in the Ministry the Hon. H. H. Stevens and Dr. Manion, the Hon. E. N. Rhodes, the Hon. C. H. Cahan, the Hon. T. G. Murphy, and my namesake, although not related, the Hon. Robert Weir. So far as I can recall his other Ministers had no previous ministerial experience.

Mr. King on the other hand, as Leader of the Opposition, even though he had lost the election, had returned with him most of his well-experienced former Ministers, and they were a pretty formidable group of people for any new Government to face. Besides Mr. King there were Col. Ralston, Ian McKenzie, W. R. Motherwell, Charles Stewart, Ernest Lapointe, Peter Veniot, Peter Heenan and "Chubby" Power, besides some pretty hard-hitting back benchers. Also on the Opposition side was the Alberta U.F.A. group headed by Bob Gardiner, as well as Miss Agnes McPhail, Mr. Woodsworth, Mr. Heaps, Henry Bourassa and Mr. Neill, and these people in the Opposition were in a position to give Mr. Bennett a very interesting time. Even so, no one had greater capacity or resourcefulness as a parliamentarian than had Mr. Bennett.

CHAPTER 4

Looking back to the 1930 election, as I am able to do, one cannot help but realize how quickly time passes on, and the scene changes. Personalities disappear either through death, political oblivion or for some other reason. Mr. Bennett, Mr. King and Mr. Woodsworth have gone to their reward, as have many others who were associated with them in the 1930 Parliament.

The U.F.A. group in Alberta, together with Miss Agnes McPhail, were very prominent in Parliament from 1921 to 1935, and were determined at all costs to avoid political entanglements with either of the other political parties. They were completely replaced in one election by the Social Credit group, and not one of them has since been re-elected. Mr. Woodsworth and Mr. Heaps, who were looked upon as Labour Members at that time, became part of the C.C.F. movement. The Hon. H. H. Stevens, who broke with Mr. Bennett in 1934 and formed the Reconstruction Party, failed to elect a single follower except himself, and has regularly met with defeat on each succeeding occasion when he offered himself as a candidate.

As a further indication of how completely and quickly the membership of the House of Commons changes, it is of some little interest to record that of the Members of the House of Commons elected in 1930 and who have been elected in each succeeding election since that time, only three are left. They are the Hon. Alphonse Fournier, Minister of Public Works, Angus MacInnis of Vancouver East, and myself. There are others who have continuously been Members for a longer period. The Dean of the House, from the point of time in continuous membership is the Hon. C. G. "Chubby" Power. On December 17th, 1952, Mr. Power completed his 35th year as a member of the House of Commons, a record only exceeded by Rt. Hon. Ernest Lapointe—37 years, Hon. Charles Marcel—36

years, Sir Wilfrid Laurier—45 years, Sir Richard Cartwright—37 years and Sir John A. MacDonald—47 years. The latter two included the period before Confederation.

Mr. Power's predecessor in his constituency of Quebec East was his father, and rumour has it that when he decides to retire, his place may be taken by his son.

A tradition in the House of Commons is for new Members to occupy seats in back rows, while older members and Ministers occupy the front row seats. "Chubby," it will be remembered, resigned from Mr. King's Government over conscription. In 1948, on the anniversary of Mr. King's birthday and Mr. Power's entry into the House of Commons, Mr. Power said in his speech, referring to his own circumstances and his resignation, that he, too, had thought of writing a book on Parliament, and he thought the title might be "Back to Front and Back Again." He went on and said—"I would tell of the long and painful progress down five rows of seats to the front benches, and I would tell also of the sharp, rapid and sudden transition from a private car to an upper berth," (referring to his method of travel as a Minister and that of a private Member). "I would," he went on, "perhaps dedicate it (the book) to the over-ambitious youths who inhabit the back benches and also to the over-pretentious ones who inhabit the front benches."

Jean Francois Pouliot has completed 28 years as a Member and J. A. Bradette (Cochrane), and Robert MacGregor (York East) 27 years. A. C. Casselman, the Chief Opposition Whip, was first elected in 1921, resigned his seat for the Hon. Arthur Meighen, and was again elected in 1925. W. J. Ward (Dauphin) was first elected in 1921, but has fallen by the wayside in two elections during the intervening years. Hon. W. E. Rowe is another of those who was elected back in 1925, and except for the time he led the Conservative Party in the Ontario election of 1937, has continuously been a Member since that time. Another rather unique parliamentarian is W. F. Carroll (Inverness-Richmond, N.S.). He was first elected to the House of Commons in 1911, was later defeated and appointed to the Bench in 1925, from which he retired in 1949, and was again elected to the House of Commons in the general election of that year. Your humble servant is now among the seven old-timers in point of unbroken membership in the House of Commons.

CHAPTER 5

Over a period of 22 years and five elections there were, as would be expected, a few incidents that are remembered, and while perhaps not of great interest to others, did appear somewhat amusing at the time to those involved.

At a meeting held at Notre Dame des Lourdes I was speaking from a rather high platform, and just when I got warmed up to heights of great eloquence, I did a disappearing act. The truth is that I stepped in front of the table onto a trap door which was not securely fastened. It gave way and I dropped through the hole until only my head was above the floor of the platform. Fortunately I was not hurt, got a good deal of sympathy from those in attendance and most of the votes at that poll.

In the 1935 election there were five candidates in Macdonald constituency—Les Bennett of Carman, as a Reconstruction candidate, Mr. McLean as the C.C.F. candidate, W. H. Spinks, the Conservative, A. M. Messner as a straight

Liberal and myself as a Liberal-Progressive. Incidentally, we heard of quite a number of people who were voting for Les Bennett, believing they were voting for R. B. Bennett, and we rather encouraged the idea as being a good thing. Needless to say the rivalry between Mr. Messner and myself was pretty warm, and particularly so between our friends. We met in a joint meeting on a Sunday afternoon at Elie, and things became so warm between our seconds on the platform that we had to call in an intermediary to separate the adherents and to restore peace and order.

In 1940 we had a meeting at Brunkild, where we were told beforehand that it might be pretty tough for us, and that an attempt might be made to break up the meeting. As a matter of fact they did give my campaign manager, Frank Ferg, a pretty rough time when he tried to make a speech. I got the platform at 4 o'clock, and spoke, continuously, until six-thirty. I held the floor for two and a half hours, partly to keep others from having a chance to speak, and in the hope that some of the more aggressive would have to go home to do the evening chores. Whatever it was, it worked; but it also finished me, as my voice was completely gone after that meeting, and I was not able to speak above a whisper for the rest of the campaign. In spite of what took place at that meeting, and it was not so very serious, we were rewarded by one old friend coming up and saying to me—"Weir, don't you worry too much over this meeting. Look down the street there, and see all those new cars and trucks, they are not so badly off."

We had Jean-Francois Pouliot out to assist us in the campaign in Lisgar in 1949, where he visited Swan Lake. The gentleman who was to look after him was most anxious to show this Eastern new-comer the places of interest in the community. He took him first to the beer parlour and then out to see Swan Lake. According to Pouliot they spent the whole day viewing beautiful Swan Lake from every angle, returning to the beer parlour with clocklike regularity.

Incidentally, our friend Pouliot told us a few days ago how he won his first election. It was a by-election and he was not the official Liberal candidate. In an effort to persuade people to vote for him he engaged a young dark-haired stranger who did not live in the constituency. He was to go from door to door and say that he was a messenger from Mr. King, and that Mr. King wanted them to vote for Mr. Pouliot. When he was asked his name the young stranger was to say that he was "Chubby" Power, which he wasn't. Needless to say Mr. Pouliot won the election.

CHAPTER 6

There are, as one would expect in a group of 262 people, many witty remarks made in and around the House of Commons. Some of them are very much to the point and particularly appropriate at the time.

One of the first I recall hearing was when a grant for a Jack Miner bird sanctuary was being discussed. There were some interjections, and a somewhat heated argument back and forth across the Chamber. Dr. Cowan, Conservative Member for Long Lake, who had a rather sharp pitched voice, rose to take part, and just as he did so a young French Member sitting near the back on the other side of the House shouted "When did that goose get out?"

Another time Mr. Esling, of Kootenay, B.C., was speaking about the Doukhobors in his constituency who had been cutting up. They had been burning schools and other buildings and had staged several nude parades. Mr. Esling

was very serious about the matter. Mr. King was in his place twiddling his glasses on his finger and did not appear to be paying attention to what was being said. Mr. Esling stopped in his speech and, looking at Mr. King said "I want the Prime Minister to listen to me. I want him to pay attention to what I am saying. I want to ask the Prime Minister what he would do if he got up some fine morning, went to his front room, ran up the window blind and saw out there on his front lawn a group of nude Doukhobors, men and women. I want to ask the Prime Minister what he would do in that kind of situation?" Mr. King rose in his place, and with a bit of a smile on his face said, "I would send for the Leader of the Opposition." Hon. R. B. Bennett was Leader of the Opposition at that time, and was also a bachelor.

Mr. King was involved in another rather interesting exchange this time down in the City of Quebec where he was visiting. He was in a reminiscent mood and was telling his friends that during the early British occupation of Quebec a grand-uncle of his had been a British officer stationed there, and that he died and was buried in Quebec. The group went with Mr. King to see his grave, and on returning Mr. King continued to speak of his old uncle, remarking that he was pretty sure he had been a Tory. Whereupon Lucien Cannon, then Solicitor-General, who was one of the group spoke up and said—"that may have been what you thought Mr. King, but I can tell you that he damned well voted Liberal in the last three elections."

There was another incident involving John Blackmore. John was always ready to make a long speech just at the time the House was not too anxious to listen to him. On this occasion Parliament was preparing to prorogue and, in fact, the hour had been set for later that day. John took the floor and proceeded to make a long speech on a matter he had discussed several times before and to which he had received answers, but they apparently did not satisfy him. He started out by saying he had thirty questions he was going to ask the Minister, and he wanted them answered if not that night then later on. He proceeded with question No. 1, question No. 2, question No. 3, and so on, developing each one as he went along. When he got up to question 15, Philcas Cote moved to a seat directly opposite John. John continued to question No. 18 and question No. 19, whereupon our French friend shouted "Bingo." The House had a particularly good laugh, as the interjection was very appropriate, but it did not frustrate John in continuing his questions.

On another occasion when the House was in Committee, John had made a forty-minute speech, extolling the virtues of Social Credit. Jean-Francois Pouliot, in a rather mischievous mood, at the end of forty minutes, asked the honourable member if he would mind explaining what he meant, whereupon John, after expressing surprise at the honourable member's lack of intelligence, proceeded forthwith to make another forty-minute speech.

The late Humphrey Mitchell was one of the good fellows to come to Ottawa. He was a good administrator, a very human man and a good politician. When he spoke back to an opponent he nearly always ended his remarks by saying—"I mean that in a kindly way," or "let me say to my Honourable friend in a kindly way."

One evening he was reading a statement to the House when he appeared to stumble over the pronunciation of a difficult word, which his desk-mate repeated for him. Humphrey retorted in an audible voice—"I can pronounce it alright, it's my damn teeth that have fallen down."

Dr. Arthur Beauchesne, long time Clerk of the House of Commons, was perhaps the most subtle and witty of anyone with his numerous recollections of incidents that enliven many of the gatherings he attended.

Another character was the late "Tommy" Church, a former Mayor of Toronto. He was genuinely kindly to everyone, but unfortunately very deaf, and spoke either in a high-pitched voice or so low he could not be heard, but his speeches always read well in Hansard, and he made plenty of them. His handwriting was terrible and if you received a note from him it looked like a piece of paper that a young chicken with muddy feet had walked over.

One time "Gerry" McGeer was making a speech when Dr. Manion interrupted by way of a question. McGeer stopped in his speech and said to Dr. Manion, "My honourable friend will someday learn that he will never listen himself into difficulty. From the remark he has just made it is apparent that he has never read the report, or if he read it he didn't understand it."

George Cruickshank of Fraser Valley will long be remembered for his frequent and pointed interjections made without any regard as to whom they were applied. The Conservatives had just completed a two-day party convention here in Ottawa. The Rt. Honourable J. L. Hsley, Minister of Finance, had introduced a measure to which Mr. Dorion, an Independent Conservative Member from Quebec, objected to proceeding with because he claimed it had not been printed in both French and English. In this he was supported by J. T. Hackett, a Conservative from Quebec and also by J. M. Macdonnell. Mr. Speaker ruled that the measure and procedure were in order, whereupon Mr. Dorion promptly appealed against the ruling, which necessitated a vote. Those in support of Mr. Speaker's ruling voted first, and to our surprise both Mr. Hackett and Mr. Macdonnell voted to support Mr. Speaker's ruling, which they had earlier spoken against. When the "Nays" were called Mr. Hackett tried to vote again, which, of course, he could not do. After the vote he rose and said that due to the noise and confusion he had inadvertently voted for Mr. Speaker's ruling, whereas he had intended to vote against it. Cruickshank immediately jumped to his feet and said—"Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Honourable gentleman if this is the new Tory policy, *Vote Both Ways*."

The late Thomas McMillan was a very ardent and hard-hitting Liberal member of the House of Commons between 1930 and 1935. He had lost his left arm just above the elbow. One evening he was speaking in the House, holding his notes in his right hand and fanning the air with the stump of his left arm. Mr. King was watching him and, turning to Ian MacKenzie said—"You know, I believe Tom is the best "off-hand" speaker we have in the House."

On another occasion Tom attended a Cabinet Ministers' Wives reception. It was a fancy formal affair. In due course Tom gathered sufficient courage to ask a lady to dance. When he took her to her seat he said he had enjoyed the dance so much that he was going to take off his overshoes and have another dance.

The Rev. Dan McIvor, M.P., once a year organizes a baseball game between members of the House of Commons and members of the press gallery. "Mike" Pearson is one of his star performers. When Dan heard that Russia had vetoed Mike's appointment as Secretary-General of the U.N. his comment was "Oh golly, now he will be here for our baseball game."

The late Sam Jacobs had the quickest and wittiest repartee of anyone in the House of Commons, whether it was with respect to his own race, to himself or to someone else. He also liked his afternoon cup of tea, and once held up a very important committee meeting by having tea served in the middle of the afternoon.

One evening the Liberal members held a dance, which Mr. and Mrs. Jacobs attended. Mrs. Jacobs was a rather large lady, and very charming. My friend Leslie Mutch came along and said to Sam "May I have a dance with your wife?"

Whereupon Sam immediately replied "Yes, by all means to Mutch, much is given."

Another time the late Lord Bennett returned to Parliament after receiving an honorary degree from an American university, and was being duly congratulated. Sam interjected "My honourable friend is getting his education by degrees." Mr. Bennett did not appreciate the inference. The next day he met Sam in company with some friends and declined to shake hands with him. Sam said, "Oh, let us shake hands 'R.B.' without prejudice."

"Doug." Abbott comes from the eastern townships near the U.S. border. After the 1949 election he was visiting the land of his youth and met a very ardent Liberal friend and said "Well, John, you did pretty well around here in the election." John replied "We sure did, and by gosh if we had another week we would have won the State of Vermont too."

CHAPTER 7

In 1940, during the early period of the war, Parliament was called in January. Mr. King asked me to second the address in reply to the speech from The Throne, and I worked diligently in the preparation of that speech.

When the speech from The Throne was read by the Governor-General there was a reference in it to the desirability of an early appeal to the country. It will be recalled that the late Mitchell Hepburn, then Premier of Ontario, and assisted by Mr. Drew, had sponsored a resolution in the Ontario Legislature critical of the Government's prosecution of the war. Apparently Mr. King, at the close of the previous Session, had given Dr. Manion, then leader of the Conservative party, an understanding that he would not call a general election before reconvening another Session of Parliament. Mr. King did call Parliament, and thus kept his undertaking to Dr. Manion. When Dr. Manion gathered the significance of what was being proposed he promptly challenged the Government and accused it of sharp practices, which apparently was what Mr. King expected and was probably waiting for. Mr. King rose quietly from his seat and moved the adjournment of the House. The Cabinet was called into Session, and before we had unpacked our suitcases we found that Parliament was dissolved and we were on our way home to face a general election, so that my carefully prepared speech was never made. I recall too, that four new Members, elected in by-elections, were introduced on that day, only to return home to face a general election.

The 1940 election was a tough wintertime election and I don't want to see any more of them. We were unable to get off the highways, and were late for a good many of our meetings, some of which we didn't get to at all.

The election was held the day after Easter Monday. Many of the roads were blocked, particularly in the hills near Swan Lake, Bruxelles and Mariapolis. However, my friend Jos. Doyon, a councillor for Lorne municipality, did us a really good turn. He very seriously asked the people around the village if they didn't think the women would like to get out to attend church on Easter Sunday, and everyone agreed that they would. He then arranged to have the municipal machinery clear the roads, and in speaking in an aside to me said—"It might help to get the vote out on Tuesday," and he happened to be right.

The sequence of events moved rapidly after the 1935 election. Mr. Bennett resigned the leadership of the Conservative party in 1938, and Dr. Manion was chosen leader at a party convention the same year, and from which he resigned

in 1942. In 1942 the Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen resigned from the Senate to accept the leadership of the party, but met defeat at the hands of Joseph Noseworthy, a C.C.F. adherent, when he stood for election in the constituency of York South. The leadership of the Conservative party in Parliament was taken over in turn by Gordon Graydon and Hon. R. B. Hanson.

In the fall of December 1942 the Conservative party held a national convention in Winnipeg at which John Bracken was elected leader, and led the party through the general election of 1945, being himself elected in the constituency of Neepawa, Manitoba. In the election of 1949 Mr. Bracken contested the constituency of Brandon but failed to be elected, and resigned from the party leadership in December, 1948.

Mr. Woodsworth relinquished the leadership of the C.C.F. party in 1940, which was taken over at that time by Mr. M. J. Coldwell.

Then came 1948, when both the Liberal and Conservative parties started preparing for the election expected in 1949. Both parties held large, enthusiastic and successful national conventions to select a new leader. Mr. King had announced his retirement from the leadership of the party, as had also Mr. Bracken. The way was thus cleared for a new leader, and both parties were able to attract several men of capacity and ability for the high office.

Among the Conservatives who offered themselves as candidates for leadership of the party were John Diefenbaker, Donald Fleming and George Drew, the latter then being Premier of Ontario. Mr. Drew was the choice of the Conservatives as leader of their party.

The Liberals offering themselves for leadership were the Rt. Hon. J. G. Gardiner, the Hon. C. G. Power and the Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent. Mr. St. Laurent was chosen leader of the Liberal party, and thus began a new page in Canadian politics.

Canada continued to gain for herself increased national status, and added prestige among the countries of the world. She secured the right to amend her own constitution, and made the Supreme Court the final Court of Appeal. A Canadian has been appointed Governor-General. Canada had declared war in her own right, and soon became the interpreter or, as Mr. Churchill said—"linchpin between the old world and the new." Her sailors, soldiers and airmen established a reputation for Canada second to none among the allied countries in their fight for freedom and decency. Her production accomplishment placed her in the forefront as an industrial nation. The Dominion-Provincial tax rental agreements gave her increased financial stability, and assisted in equalizing social services and other needs among the various provinces. Newfoundland became the tenth province of Canada.

CHAPTER 8

Ottawa, during the month of July, can get very hot. In the incident about which I am thinking the late Hon. W. R. Motherwell was the victim. He had been persuaded by his wife that he would be cooler and more comfortable if he would wear a belt rather than suspenders to hold up his trousers, something to which he was not accustomed to, and for which he was the wrong shape. He was in the Chamber most of this hot afternoon, and while waiting for an opportunity to make a speech had loosened his belt, and apparently had forgotten that he had done so. He finally got his chance to speak, and became quite dramatic and demonstrative, waving his arms around for effect, while his trousers slowly but obviously slipped lower and lower until, with a final gesture, to accompany what he was saying, his trousers slipped down almost to the point of embarrassment, much to the amusement of his colleagues in the House and the spectators in the galleries, who witnessed the dilemma in which the grand old gentleman suddenly found himself.

The Protestant members of the House, on one occasion entertained at dinner some high dignitaries of the United Church of Canada. Mr. King, a continuing Presbyterian, attended the dinner. He was called on to speak, and made one of the wittiest, off-the-cuff speeches I ever heard him make, much of which was at the expense of the adherents of the United Church in their having fallen by the wayside in breaking away from the Presbyterians.

He made reference to the Church Union Bill, and in so doing said that no one could tell church people anything about conducting a parliamentary lobby. He went on to tell them of the time the vote on the Church Union Bill was about to take place when the members of the different groups were rushing around trying to gather in their adherents. One member, in his anxiety, happened to see a man standing over beside the wall. He went to him and said, "Excuse me sir, are you for Church Union?" The man turned and replied, "Hell no, I am just the House of Commons' plumber."

James Sinclair is one member who delights in an exchange with his opponents, whether it is at his own expense or not, and who usually has a pretty effective reply to anything said to him. On the occasion that I have in mind he was just starting to pilot certain budget resolutions through the House for Mr. Abbott. Mr. Sinclair has a family of five charming young daughters. They and their mother came to watch their daddy. The youngest one, about three years old, was the first one to enter the gallery, and when she saw her daddy she shouted, in a fine child's voice that could be heard in every corner of the Chamber, "Hello, Daddy." Jimmy was naturally quite non-plussed, and admitted that his family could be of greater embarrassment to him with their ill-timed interjections than were Members of the Opposition.

In the 1935 election we had received a very good vote in the area near St. Eustache, known locally as "Fort Rouge." The people there live frugally and, for the most part, in one- or two-roomed log houses, and are a very friendly, hospitable group, living close together. After the election they invited me to bring some friends and have a little party, which I did. Their accommodation was rather limited, but with their houses close together we were able to leave our hats in one house, our overcoats in another, eat in another, and dance in still another. It all went off very nicely and my friends, particularly Tom Frederickson and Russ Porter of Carman had a delightful time.

A few days after this party I received a letter which read as follows—

"Dear Sir: I am going to try my luck. I need a new coat. I am size 42. If you cannot send me a new coat send me \$15.00 or \$20.00. Cut of coat included.

Yours truly

Thinking there might have been a mistake I re-addressed the letter, in a new envelope to my friend Tom. When he opened it his face turned noticeably red. He showed it to another friend who had been on the party and asked him what he should do about it, at the same time saying that he was awfully glad his wife hadn't got hold of it.

The friend read the letter very earnestly, having been previously advised about it, and replied "Well, if you want to keep that gal quiet there is only one thing for you to do and that is to buy the coat." After a day or so Tom realized that the letter was not for him so he mailed it to another member of the party whose daughter happened to be taking care of his office mail. The daughter opened the letter and promptly said, "Dad what is this about buying a coat? You know that I need a coat and so does Mother." The incident aroused considerable local interest among the ladies around town, trying to find out how they could go about getting a new coat. However, I am afraid they were all doomed to disappointment.

CHAPTER 9

The membership of the House of Commons is a pretty true cross-section of human nature, and pretty truly representative of the people of Canada. There are the bright boys who apply themselves with diligence, and there are those who do not work so hard. There are those who like to make long speeches on everything that comes up, and there are those who do not speak at all, but seem to be equally successful in being re-elected, which must mean that they are diligent in matters relating to their constituents. One older sage frequently reminds new Members that the speeches they do not make will never do any harm, and never have to be explained.

I have likened the House of Commons to living in residence at university or to a game of chess. To explain what I mean, try to picture the setup in the House of Commons. On one side of the Chamber, to the right of Mr. Speaker, we have the Cabinet Ministers and the Government members. This is the party responsible for policy, and the conduct of the business of the country in so far as the Government is concerned.

On the other side we have the Opposition, eager to become the Government, always looking for wrong-doings of the Ministry or, in fact, any Member of the Government party. It is always watching for an opportunity to catch any member off-guard and to eliminate him as one would a pawn or, to clear the whole board, as one might do in a game of chess. The members on the Government side take the same attitude in so far as the Opposition is concerned. In a sense it is a game, a battle of wits, with some attempt to score for advantage, but generally of a serious character.

On the other hand there is good fellowship among the members of all parties. There is respect and admiration, regardless of party affiliation. Energy, integrity and humility are the marks of character among Members, as in other walks of life. The friendships and associations are just as genuine and just as lasting as are those made at university. There is also the time of exami-

nations which, in the case of a Member of Parliament, comes when he is obliged to return to his constituency to seek re-election, as it is with the university student at the time of examinations. If they have neglected their homework, some will fall by the wayside.

The House of Commons has its share of athletes and others with creditable accomplishments. Lionel Conacher, recognized as the outstanding Canadian athlete of his time, is a Member for a Toronto constituency. Then there are "Bucko" McDonald and Howie Meeker of hockey renown. In tripping the light fantastic "Jimmy" Gardiner has always been willing to oblige with a demonstration of the sailor's hornpipe, as indeed was the late Ian McKenzie with the sword dance. Paul Hellyer of Toronto, a very accomplished soloist, is credited with singing his way into Parliament. Several of our French Members are high-class versatile entertainers, well able to enliven any gathering and, frequently, towards the closing days of a session while waiting for a vote to be taken, lead the Members of the House of Commons by breaking into song with "Allouette," "Macnamara's Band" and "Show Me The Way To Go Home."

Parliament is really a great institution. It is a great public forum, which functions well under the two-party system of a Government and an Opposition. I am an admirer of the party system, but not too many parties. It is the soundest and safest system yet evolved for governing a people who want freedom and who want to be a part of the system. With the party system it is, of course, imperative that there shall be freedom of speech, a free press and a constitution that requires elections to be held at regular intervals. The members of the press gallery are an equally important part of the system, as is indeed the Judiciary, which stands as a referee or interpreter in carrying out the intent of the will of the majority as proclaimed in the statutes of the country, and the regulations made thereunder.

Free discussion, full publicity and rivalry for office between Parties not only safeguards the individual rights and freedoms but is also an assurance of honesty in government. No government can last if it disregards public opinion, and knowing this it will always hasten to correct a wrong, fully conscious of the day when it will have to submit the record of its stewardship to the judgment of public opinion in a general election. There is scarcely an item of importance that cannot be raised in Parliament, where publicity and reason assures that a wrong will be righted. Incidentally, one of the best speeches I ever listened to, on what I have tried to convey, was made quite spontaneously by Mr. Bennett when he was Prime Minister, and when he found it was necessary to straighten out certain Members of the Opposition who were acting a little unreasonable.

We frequently hear comments as to why people go into public life. I certainly do not think many do so with any thought of material gain. They do so because they, or their friends, feel that they can make a contribution. The reward of public service is what one can contribute rather than with any hope of gain, just as it is with one's church or other community effort, be it a lodge or a service club. This leads me to make a reference to the costs of conducting an election campaign, and the means used in raising the necessary funds for essential election expenses. My own view has always been that under our democratic system the political association of a constituency should provide the money necessary to pay the legitimate expenses of the candidate of their choosing, rather than have the candidate bear the cost, or to have the finances come from some unknown source. Most of us make annual contributions to our churches, lodges, service clubs and other community undertakings as a matter of course, and without being asked. Surely it is just as worthy, just as

honourable and just as necessary to make a contribution to further one's political views as it is to support other community activities, not even excepting contribution to one's church. A membership of only 500 people in a country constituency making regular annual contributions could easily build up a fund that would be adequate to pay the necessary expenses of an election campaign and meet the costs of activities between elections, as well as contributing something towards a central organization. The adherence to this principle would inspire added confidence in political life, it would encourage more capable people to offer themselves as candidates who may feel that they cannot afford to do so and would, at the same time, cause contributors to feel that they are a part of our system of governing ourselves, and thereby encourage added interest in the affairs of their party. In a properly functioning democracy, with enthusiastic party workers, the costs do not need to be very large.

CHAPTER 10

I am sure everyone must be impressed, and feel a great sense of pride, the first time they see our Canadian Parliament Buildings.

I saw them for the first time in 1922 when I came to Ottawa as a representative of the Canadian Council of Agriculture to present the resolutions of the farm organizations to the Government.

When one walks up from the Chateau Laurier Hotel, or the Union Station, past the War Memorial, and through the outer gates of the Parliament Buildings grounds, he will see before him three buildings, all of a similar architectural design and construction. These are the Parliament Buildings. They are known as the Center Block, the East Block and the West Block.

They were built of a soft sandstone, and were pointed between the stones with a dark-colored mortar, that in a way has run from weathering. This stone, together with the copper roofs, has given an appearance of age to what are relatively new as Parliament Buildings. The Center Block was rebuilt after the fire of 1916. The other buildings were built in 1860.

The buildings impressed me as being substantial, solid, durable, and yet there was a humaneness about them that seemed to portray in their outward appearance the hopes, the aspirations and the character of the Canadian people. From their inner Chambers the legislators of the land make the rules of law and order to guide and to guard the ways of our mode of living in all parts of Canada. They seem to portray the history of our country, its tradition and, even more so, its stability and hopes for the future. Their aged appearance made me feel that here was the cornerstone to the foundation upon which we were to build a nation, spread over half the continent.

The site for the Parliament Buildings was chosen by the late Queen Victoria in 1859, and her choice was a most fortunate one. They are located on an elevation of land jutting out into the Ottawa river. Directly across the river is the city of Hull in the province of Quebec, the river being the dividing line between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The location has an added significance when associated with the early settlement of this part of the country, when it was largely covered by bush and great forests. There were no roads. Most travelling was by water. Any attack by warring Indian tribes would be made from the river. This projection of land out into the river, and rising as it does like a straight wall about one hundred feet up from the water, allowed

for a clear vision both up and down the river, and as a wall that it would be difficult for any foe to scale. It was indeed a great vantage point for a fort or lookout.

The Peace Tower over the main entrance to the Center Block contains the Memorial Chamber. Around its archway are inscribed these words—"The wholesome sea is at her gates; her gates both east and west." It was built since I first saw the Parliament Buildings, and lends added dignity and a sacredness, towering as it does some three hundred feet in the air. In it are the great bells of the Carillon, and the big clock. Many of you have heard by radio the Carillon, and the striking of the clock, and I am sure it must have given you a feeling that this was your institution, and you were part of it.

The Memorial Chamber is the finest monument of its kind to be seen anywhere. The materials for its construction were gifts to Canada from our original allies in World War I. It was built in the rough and then by hammer and chisel the sculptor carved, in intimate detail, every phase of Canadian participation in World War I. In the center of the room is the Altar, around which are engraved the coats of arms of all the provinces, and lying open inside is the beautiful hand-engraved Memorial Book, in which is contained the name of every Canadian soldier who made the supreme sacrifice in the first World War. A page of this book is turned each day, showing two pages of names of soldiers. It is so arranged that those in charge can tell the day on which a particular name will appear. Over the entrance are carvings of the reindeer, the mule, the horse, the dog, carrier pigeons, mice and canaries, symbolizing the silent partners who also played their part in the war. Over the entrance is the ministering angel and the dove of peace, and just below is a replica of the Memorial Medal issued to next-of-kin. Around the archway are engraved these words: "All's well, for over there among His Peers a Happy Warrior sleeps."

At the rear of the Center Block is the Library of Parliament, the only part of the original Center Block that was not destroyed by fire when the Parliament Buildings were burned in 1916. It is a fascinating building, with a great high dome of a distinctive architectural design all its own. It has a squeaky old wood parquet floor. What is even more impressive is the magnificent carving of its beautiful woodwork. While the library is not looked upon as being modern, as compared to present day libraries no one, in spite of the serious fire last year, has had courage enough to say that it should be torn down and rebuilt. It has thus become part of Parliament, and everyone wants to retain it as it is.

The interior of the Parliament Buildings is faced with Manitoba Tyndall stone, and there is much that could be written about its carvings, paintings and other appointments. Likewise, there is much that could be said of the Chambers of the Senate and the House of Commons. The only new innovation of recent times is the installation of a loud speaker system in the Commons Chamber.

My purpose, in writing as I have, has been to try to convey my impressions when I first saw these buildings, their beauty, their stability, their appearance of age and the sense of tradition that seems to rest with them, even though they are relatively new as a seat of government. On constant vigil, guarding the entrances, parade officers of the R.C.M.P. who, in the summer season, perform their duties mounted on horseback. They are thus the target of every tourist's camera and are, without doubt, the most photographed people on Parliament Hill.

CHAPTER 11

In an earlier chapter I referred to the party system of Government. I thought I might now try to define what I conceive to be a political party. A political party is nothing more or less than a "group of people," people with similar ideas, similar viewpoints and outlook, and a similar approach to common problems, who have compromised their differences to the point where they have reached common ground and agreement on the main principles they believe in and which they think should be put into practice. In a country as widespread as Canada, and with a variety of conditions, a political party must have a wide universally accepted approach to the main features of national policy, and in no sense can it be "sectional" or "provincial" if it hopes to be successful.

Once having reached agreement on its main principles, the group, or party, has a right to try to persuade others to its point of view, and if successful in persuading the majority, at a properly held election, it has the right, in our democratic way of doing things, to form the Government, and have its principles and policies made the basis of governing the country. A first step to that end is, of course, to form an organization with specified people designated to further their principles as officers and to provide its leadership.

A country like Canada, stretching as it does some three thousand miles from east to west, and from the 49th parallel to the hinterlands of the north and including Newfoundland, is admittedly a difficult country to govern. There is, in the very nature of things, a variety of conditions in an area of this size. The Fathers of Confederation recognized the problem. They wisely made provision for one central government and a number of provincial governments (now 10), each with specific fields of jurisdiction. It would have been impossible to bring about Confederation without a provision of this kind, and frequently we still find a conflict of interests, which only serves to emphasize the difficulty of governing this country. We can be thankful that so far the plan has stood the test, and that under wise leadership we are finding that we have much more that unites us than we have that divides us, and that the bonds of Confederation are as strong today as they ever have been.

A prospective recruit would naturally look to the people associated with a movement, and would want to know something of their background, their history, their traditions, their trustworthiness, their sense of public duty and their general attitude to common problems. He would be particularly interested and influenced by its leadership. He would look for leadership that would be competent, that represented his point of view, and that he could trust and be willing to follow. Having thus decided he would then determine where and how he could contribute most towards the promotion and well-being of the group or party of his choosing.

In a democracy it is not enough for a political party to rely on its principles, regardless of how good they may be. As with any group or organization a political party must continue to grow and to build, using perhaps a new approach to changing conditions. It must not only constantly proclaim what it has done but instead go forward to gather new adherents. It must particularly appeal to younger people who may not have had the same background of experience that brought about the organization in the first instance. A process of education, and of doing things, should be the constant part of any political party's efforts if its influence is to continue, and it is to meet the competition of rival political parties with different points of view.

A political party should always remember that it is a servant of the people,

and that it secures its strength and its right to govern from the people. Its motto might well be:

Government by the people for the people;
Promotion of the general, rather than the particular interest;
Reasoned discussion as against dictatorship;
Free speech, free press and freedom of religion;
Free elections at regular intervals.

In its search for new adherents, and to gain the enthusiasm of youth, a political party must appeal particularly to those who are voters for the first time. This is something older people should recognize, and should assist in creating an atmosphere that the younger people are really wanted and appreciated. The attitude towards group organizations and leadership, be it a political party or any other group activity, is so well expressed in an article entitled *Basic Needs of People in Groups* that I propose to quote from it. It is as follows:

"Leader. If you want my loyalty, interest, and best efforts as a group member, you must take into account the fact that . . .

1. I need a sense of belonging;
 - (a) A feeling that no one objects to my presence;
 - (b) A feeling that I am sincerely welcome;
 - (c) A feeling that I am honestly needed for my total self, not just for my hands, my money, etc.
2. I need to have a share in planning the group goals. My need will be satisfied only when I feel that my ideas have had a fair hearing.
3. I need to feel that the goals are within reach, and that they make sense to *me*.
4. I need to share in making the rules of the group--the rules by which together we shall live and work toward our goals.
5. I need to feel that what I am doing contributes to human welfare--that its value extends beyond the group itself.
6. I need to know in some clear detail just what is expected of me so that I can work confidently.
7. I need to have the responsibilities that challenge, that are within range of my abilities, and that contribute toward reaching our goals.
8. I need to see that progress is being made toward the goal we have set.
9. I need to be kept informed. What I'm not up on I may be down on.
10. I need to have confidence in our leader. Confidence based upon assurance of consistent fair treatment, of recognition when it is due, and trust that loyalty will bring increased security.

In brief--the situation in which I find myself must make sense to me regardless of how much sense it makes to the leader."

CHAPTER 12

Generally speaking, people in a democracy get pretty well the type of representation that suits them, and the kind of government they want. It is of course true that personalities, apart from political parties play a part, and vice versa, but that bears out the other. We have been very fortunate in Canada that we have always had men of capacity, integrity and with a high sense of duty to head our governments. We have not had many "skeletons in the closet," or even experiences that have caused us to blush very much. In these respects we have been fortunate.

In an earlier chapter I extolled the merits of party system in government, but added—"not too many parties." My reason for a further reference to the same matter is that with the party system it is equally essential to have stability. By that I mean a party elected with a large enough following that it can carry out its policies and administer the affairs of the country without having to rely on other groups or parties. A multiplicity of parties, as we have witnessed in other countries, endangers stability of government, and lowers the prestige of Parliament, besides giving to small minority groups, when holding a balance of power, an importance beyond what their public support or their representation entitles them to.

We frequently hear people say that Members do not pay attention to their representations. That kind of an observation is not borne out, and is just not true. There is no group of people as politically conscious, or as sensitive as are Members of Parliament, in attempting to appraise public reaction to the larger issues of public policy, or in attempting to adjust grievances, be they large or small. On the contrary, Members are often dismayed to find that even some of their ardent supporters or ardent critics frequently do not know when Parliament is in session.

It is sometimes contended that the two old parties, Liberals and Conservatives, have failed to move with the times, and that they have been more interested in retaining the status quo of private enterprise than in having the State launch into new fields of activity as necessity would appear to demand. This is the argument of the Socialists, whose objective is to have the State direct all the activities of the country. The record of the two older parties, which have governed Canada since Confederation, of course does not bear out this contention. The fact is that every piece of social legislation that we have, and every business activity that the Government is engaged in at the federal level, was brought about by one or other of the old parties, even though they continued to adhere to the principle of private enterprise. The social legislation and Crown Corporations is the answer to that claim and the record of both Liberals and Conservatives is as significant as it is impressive.

The Conservative party, led by Mr. Bennett, put Canada into business in a pretty big way. The government of Mr. Bennett put the country into the business of marketing wheat, which led to the creation of the Canadian Wheat Board, and later included the marketing of coarse grains. Mr. Bennett's Government introduced the legislation to create the Central Bank, and was also responsible for establishing the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and national control of radio broadcasting. It is true that these measures have been modified and changed from time to time, but the principle remains as enacted by a former Conservative Government.

During the war the present Liberal Government was obliged to go into business in a pretty big way, and some of the experiences gained no doubt had an influence on policies that have since been pursued. Apart from the war, it was a

Liberal Government that placed Canada in the aviation business, and did much to give us the prominence that this country now holds in that field. It also lent encouragement to the discovery, by air, of some of our great northern treasures that might have been left hidden for generations had it not been for the airplane. Furthermore, air travel has played an important part in bringing the people of the outlying areas of Canada much closer together.

Our synthetic rubber plant at Sarnia is but another example of the Government going into what normally would be considered a private endeavour, but which was undertaken as a necessity, and there is no indication of the Government wishing to discontinue being in this business.

The atomic energy plant at Chalk River is another illustration of the Government not hesitating to go into business, even though it adhered to the principle of private enterprise.

The National Research Council, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, as indeed the Canada Farm Loans Board, and the ownership of terminal elevators are other examples of the Government in business. The C.N.R. is but another illustration of the Government in business, brought about in a somewhat different manner. The trend in this regard is even more impressive among provincial governments and municipalities, examples of which are provincial telephone and hydro electric systems, with some of our cities also being in the public transportation business.

There is justification for free enterprise political parties entering what may be looked upon as the domain of private endeavour. It is perfectly logical and proper for governments to undertake projects that take a long time to develop, or public works, to stimulate employment, where private capital is not readily available, and where the returns may be delayed, and in instances where there is an experimental element involved, and from which immediate returns may not be forthcoming, but where the long time results may be very important.

My references to these items are only for the purpose of illustration, and there are many others that could be added. While we look upon the activities of Government as being largely for the purpose of regulating things, administering justice and for instituting social services, such as family allowances, old age pensions, unemployment insurance, health services, assistance to education, research and the like, the fact is that both the Conservative and Liberal parties have put the country, which means the people of Canada, in business in a pretty big way, and in a manner that has been just about as rapid and as far as the people of Canada were prepared to go.

In following the course that it has, there has constantly been a recognition that under the system of private enterprise the people of Canada enjoy one of the highest standards of living, while at the same time retaining the greatest measure of freedom and tolerance of any country in the world.

CHAPTER 13

OFFICE OF CHIEF GOVERNMENT WHIP

I am going to attempt to write a story on the office of the Chief Government Whip, an office which it has been my privilege to occupy since 1945. In doing so I hope I may be forgiven if I project something of the personal element into what I write. I am, however, relieved in doing so and also assisted by having in my possession a very good story on the whip's office and duties written by one of my predecessors, the late Samuel Charters, who was at one time Chief Whip of the Conservative Party, and I shall rely, to a considerable extent, on what he had to say of the office.

The name "Whip" as associated with Parliament, is derived from the old English hunting expression "whipper-in," and comes to us, as so many things do, from the Mother of Parliaments. The Chief Whip is sort of "aide-de-camp" or a "liaison" between the private members and the party leader. He is privileged to sit immediately behind his leader, and in the case of the Government Whip, in the Ministerial section. The Opposition groups have their Party Whips, as indeed do the various provincial groups on the Government side. The provincial whips are the contacts with the Chief Whip, in so far as the Government party is concerned. Thus on the Government side we have a Chief Whip and ten provincial whips. Sometimes an assistant whip is appointed.

At each new Parliament one of the tasks of the Chief Government Whip in consultation with a couple of Ministers, the leader of the Opposition and the whips of the Opposition Parties, is to allocate office accommodation to Members. The practice generally followed is to allocate the better offices to senior Members, and if they have been in Parliament for more than two Parliaments to try to provide them with a single office. However, the real problem arises in allocating offices that have to be shared by two Members.

Here all the whims of human nature arise. There is the boisterous chap, who probably likes to entertain a good deal, as against the quiet, studious man. To put two men of widely different temperaments into the same office simply creates an intolerable situation. Then there is the "smoker" as against the "non-smoker," the man who wants his office hot and the one who likes it cool. Even more important is that their wives be friendly. But oh, the headaches when one Member's wife spends quite a bit of time in her husband's office, which he is sharing with another Member.

The second chore has to do with seating arrangements in the House of Commons. The practice is in reverse to that followed when we went to school. In the House of Commons the senior Members are given the front row seats, and closest to the Ministers, while new Members have to take the back row seats. Consideration has sometimes to be given to Members with faulty hearing, even to the point of seating them to the right or left of the Ministry, depending on which is the Member's bad ear. It usually takes most of the first session before these matters are worked out.

The next task of the Chief Whip, and it occurs every Session, is to set up the select standing and special committees. There are 15 standing committees and usually three to six special committees. The first step in doing so follows after the Prime Minister submits a motion on the opening of Parliament naming what is generally known as a "striking committee," to report on the names of Members to constitute the various committees, etc. This "striking committee," in recent times, consists of two Cabinet Ministers, the Chief Government Whip, the Chief

Opposition Whip and the whip of either the C.C.F. or Social Credit group, the latter two alternating. This committee decides on the numerical representation of the various parties on the different committees. Generally the basis of representation on the committees is the same as the party ratio of representation in the House of Commons.

When the formula of representation has been agreed to, the Chief Government Whip then advises the Opposition Whips of the committees to be set up, the number to be on each committee and the number each party is entitled to have on each committee. He, at the same time, has to calculate the representation for each province of Government supporters. This, too, is on the basis of the provincial representation of each province to the total number of Government supporters elected. He then asks the provincial whips for their recommendations. The recommendations of provincial whips and of the Opposition whips are all turned in to him, and he announces them to the House of Commons and asks the House to approve the recommendations.

In setting up the committees he has also to consider who should be recommended as chairmen of the various committees. This is done in consultation with the Cabinet, and is approved by the Ministry. The chairman, of course, is always a Government Member. The tradition in our Parliament has been to give a committee chairmanship to each province, and at the same time try to keep a reasonable balance between French-speaking and English-speaking Members.

There is one departure from the general practice of the whips setting up the various committees, and that is when a special committee is asked for. In the case of a special committee requested by a Minister for some special task, the Minister concerned has the privilege of recommending whom he would like to have on the committee, and also to object to anyone whom he feels should not be on the committee. It is generally settled amicably.

Once the committees are organized they are supposed to be on their own. However, it seldom works out that way. It is the Whip's job to see that committee rooms are allocated, and that they undertake whatever assignment is referred to them by the House of Commons. A committee can only deal with matters that have been referred to it by the House of Commons and, in turn, report back to the House of Commons. It is not permitted to depart from its order of reference without securing authority from the House of Commons. The Whip's duty is to see that there is a quorum in attendance at committees and, more important, that the majority in attendance are Government supporters.

When it comes to the debates in the House of Commons the day-to-day programme is discussed with the House leader, who is always a Minister, and agreement is reached on the procedure to be followed in disposing of the various items that appear on the Order Paper. If the Government wishes to continue a long debate, the Whip must advise the members, and urge them to make speeches. If it is to be a short debate he then has to devise some means of persuading the Government members either not to make speeches or to reduce the length of their speeches.

In the more formal debates, such as the Address in Reply to the Speech from The Throne, and the budget, when the field is wide open to talk on anything and everything, there is a good deal of conferring with the Opposition whips in an effort to agree on the time when various members will be able to speak. Members generally prefer this practise, as it allows them to know in advance on what day their turn is likely to come and whether it will be in the afternoon or the evening.

Back between 1945 and 1949 the Chief Whip just had to have full knowledge of who was going to speak and for how long. Not only that, he had to hold back

three or four of his ready speakers who could be called on should the Opposition stop putting up speakers and the Government was not ready, due to lack of attendance to take the vote. It frequently happened, when we had a small majority, that the Opposition stopped speaking around 10 p.m. The House then closed at 11 p.m. If the Government supporters were not on hand a vote could just not be taken, so it meant the Government members had to resort to the practice of talking until closing time at 11 o'clock. It frequently occurred that Government members had to keep a debate going until we were sure there were enough supporters on hand to carry the vote or defeat a particular motion. This condition may be peculiar to Ottawa. It comes about because of the larger representation from Ontario and Quebec, and particularly from the Toronto and Montreal areas, where it is convenient for members from these places to go home weekends. For years they have had the habit of doing so, and often not returning before Tuesday. They are known as the "T. and T. Members" (Tuesday to Thursday). They have been cajoled, cussed, sworn at and threatened, but it is ever thus. The result is that the members from farther away, the West and the Maritime Provinces, have to pretty well hold the fort over weekends. The whip also notifies members of the House of Commons and of the Senate of party caucus meetings.

CHAPTER 14

OFFICE OF CHIEF GOVERNMENT WHIP

At Westminster the office of Chief Government Whip has assumed greater importance than is the case in Canada. The Chief Whip there is rated as a Cabinet Minister, and is paid a salary. His office is next door to that of the Prime Minister. He attends Cabinet meetings and assists in planning the work of the House of Commons. He also pretty well controls patronage or preferment within the party. The Ministers confer with him on appointments, which carries with it a certain measure of discipline. He can also pretty well determine who is to make speeches. Where they have over 600 members it would be impossible for every member to make a speech. If they did so it would simply mean that the work of Parliament would never be completed. Their long experience has shown that they have had to cut down on debates, with the result that they have accepted the practice of allotting time for specific debates. The time allotted for a debate is recommended by the Ministry, and then the whips agree on the number of members who can participate.

The members wishing to speak submit their names to either Mr. Speaker or to their party whip, or to both. The Whip intimates to Mr. Speaker the names of certain members he thinks could make a contribution, and these are usually the people that Mr. Speaker recognizes, and when the time allotted is taken up Mr. Speaker just does not see anyone else. This practice prompted Mr. Churchill, at the time he was wandering in the political wilderness to say that for some years he had been unable to catch Mr. Speaker's eye, and thereby did not have a chance to speak in Parliament. The United Kingdom Parliament has several devices for curtailing debate and, in effect, it means that they have accepted the principle of "closure," and also what they call the "guillotine," in order to get the business of Parliament done. In Canada we have not gone anything like that far, and "closure" has only been used on rare occasions.

They have another practice at Westminster that is not followed in Canada, and that is with respect to the office of Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in the

United Kingdom, as in Canada, is elected by Parliament. However, once elected in the United Kingdom he continues to hold the office in succeeding Parliaments, even though there may have been a change of Government. In fact, he is usually not opposed in seeking re-election in his Constituency. In Canada, on the other hand, the practice is to elect a new Speaker at every new Parliament and, in addition, to alternate the choice between French and English speaking members. When we have an English-speaking Speaker we have, at the same time, a French-speaking Deputy Speaker.

The really important function of the Chief Government Whip is, of course, to make sure that enough Government members are on hand to sustain the party on any vote that may be called, whether that vote takes place with Mr. Speaker in the chair or when the House is in "Committee of the Whole" or at "outside" committee meetings. During the Parliament of 1945 to 1949 the Government had a majority of nine Members, and at times, due to illness, it was as low as five or six. This naturally did cause some concern, and kept us very much on the alert. The Government depends on the Chief Whip to advise as to when it is safe to take a vote or not to take a vote. If there are not enough Government members on hand to sustain a Government motion it would mean the defeat of the Government, and under our constitutional practice the Opposition has the right to take over the Government or, it could mean the calling of a general election. The Whip, therefore, has to know where every member and minister is, and be in a position to order him into the House or, if need be, to attend committee meetings. More than once during that period Ministers were called from important conferences to get down to the House or to attend a committee meeting. One of the most surprised gentlemen over this rather abrupt treatment from the Chief Government Whip was our own Minister, Mr. Garson, when he first came to Ottawa, and who was not accustomed, while Premier of Manitoba, to be pushed around in this manner.

We had to be concerned over every vote, unless we knew beforehand that the Opposition vote would be divided, but at that time there were only two occasions when we were unduly concerned over taking a vote. The first occurred on a surprise amendment by the Social Credit group late on a Friday night when a number of members on both sides had gone home. The vote came unexpectedly. That night we must have rung the "call" bells for a full half hour, and I know of at least three members that were roused from their beds and brought down to the Chamber, one of them a Cabinet Minister.

When Mr. Speaker is in the chair, and the House is in regular session and a vote is called, "division" bells ring all over the building notifying the members to come down to the Chamber. The length of time that the bells are allowed to ring is in the hands of the Chief Government Whip, and he can keep them ringing until he is certain all his members are on hand for the vote. It is usually about eight minutes. At that, we have frequently seen members arrive in the Chamber from the barber shop with only half their face shaved.

When the House is in "Committee of the Whole," however, the bells do not ring, and there is no notice of when a vote may be called, and this is the time when we always have to be on guard to avoid getting caught in a "snap" vote, particularly when the House is about equally divided between Government and Opposition, or when a number of committees are meeting.

The other time was near the end of 1945, when an important vote was due to take place. We had telegraphed all our out-of-town members to be on hand, as we knew all the Opposition would be voting against the Government. While we had checked and rechecked both our side of the House and also the Opposition we knew the margin would be close. There were two amendments on

which the Opposition was divided, and we rechecked again when the vote was being taken and before the vote on the main motion, and had calculated our majority would be four or five. Just as we were preparing to take the final vote one of our members, who was disgruntled over something, got up and went out. That was, I think, the most anxious experience I had as Chief Whip. A defeat on that motion meant the defeat of the Government. There was one little incident associated with it, however, that I appreciated very much. It occurred just as we were to take the final vote when an Opposition Whip came to me and asked if we were all right. I had no idea what he was prepared to do, but told him that I thought we were and would take our chance on the vote, and it turned out all right. We had a majority of four votes.

I fear I have burdened you with too long a story, although there are many things associated with the Whip's office in Parliament that could be added, particularly the personal incidents that arise from day to day, and the excuses that are given by members as to why they have to go home, or be away from Parliament, and the reason they do not like rooming with a certain member. On one occasion a member confided that his wife was about to have a baby, and that he just had to go home. I told him he could go but that he had to get a "pair." A "pair," or "pairing" is a practice whereby members from opposing sides agree to abstain from voting if either is absent. It has no official recognition, and those who enter into the arrangement are required to furnish the Chief Whip with a signed statement that they are "paired." There was an occasion some years ago when a member forgot he was "paired" and inadvertently voted, resulting in the defeat of the Government.

CHAPTER 15

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

In 1948 the Empire Parliamentary Association met in London, England, as guests of the United Kingdom Branch of the Association. Some 15 delegates attended from Canada, representing all parties in the House of Commons, the Senate and the provincial legislatures.

The Empire Parliamentary Association, as it was then known, is composed of Members of Parliament and of the Legislatures of the British Commonwealth other than Ministers of the Crown. Its purpose is to review policies and parliamentary practices common to all parts of the Commonwealth. It does not, however, formally resolve on matters of policy, but the delegates may undertake to convey the viewpoint of the Association to their respective Governments.

The 1948 meeting took place shortly after India had gained full National status and had set up a republican form of Government. This changed situation immediately raised the question as to the position of a Republic within the association. The difficulty was resolved at the suggestion of the Canadian delegation whereby the name of the organization was changed to the "Commonwealth Parliamentary Association."

In 1952 the association met in Canada as guests of the Canadian branch. Some 90 overseas delegates from all parts of the Commonwealth attended. They were in Canada for about three weeks and toured our country from coast to coast, as well as undertaking a number of side trips. They had a very good look at Canada, and expressed themselves as being very much impressed.

They were part of a weekend in Manitoba as guests of the Manitoba branch. Their arrival on a Saturday at noon, and having to leave Sunday evening, did not permit of showing them many things we would have liked them to see, such as the meat packing industry and the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. They were taken to Lower Fort Garry for lunch, to the University, through the Legislative Building and for drives around the city. During the Saturday afternoon visit we were able to show them a country elevator and something of our farm lands near Winnipeg. At the banquet, tendered by the Government of Manitoba the same evening, they were shown an interesting film on Northern Manitoba. What they said they enjoyed most was the opportunity, on Sunday afternoon, to visit in some of our Manitoba homes as guests of Members of the Legislature.

I was with the delegation in 1948, and besides the United Kingdom, visited Holland and Belgium and saw something of their great sea walls and what they mean, particularly to Holland. The miles of dykes and canals have to be seen to be appreciated. We actually travelled through the country that was deliberately flooded by the Germans in World War II. Even when we were there the dykes had been repaired and the water pumped out, and the land made ready for cropping. We also saw something of the damage done to their great shipping ports. What I remembered particularly of Holland was their intriguing system of canals, their tidy well kept farms with their luscious growth, their clean and tidy country-side, cities and villages and, equally fascinating, the abundance of beautiful flowers. One could see flowers almost everywhere. We visited a very well-kept Canadian cemetery, and were told that local families had undertaken to care for the graves. Many were planted with flowers and shrubs. It will be remembered that when Queen Juliana returned to her homeland after her sojourn in our country she sent to Canada as a token of appreciation a large number of tulip bulbs. These bulbs, in season, now lend an added beauty to our Canadian capital.

We also saw much of London and the damage done to that great city, and were equally impressed by the extent the damage had been removed. The visit took us through many of the old historical places throughout England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales, as well as the trip to Holland, Belgium and West Germany. The conference itself was held in the British House of Commons. It too had been damaged by bombs and the British Parliament was then holding its sessions in the Chamber of the House of Lords. One highlight of the trip was when we witnessed the opening of Parliament. It was the first time since the war that the traditional ceremony was carried out with all its customary pomp, color and dignity. We were inside the Chamber and saw Their Majesties enter and leave, preceded and followed by all the dignitaries, bedecked in their colorful robes, that go with the tradition of opening Parliament. We heard His Majesty read the speech from The Throne. Outside the pageantry was equally colorful and impressive, with a full complement of foot-guards, mounted escorts, and the King's carriage drawn by six white horses.

We were invited by Their Majesties to Buckingham Palace. This was indeed a thrilling experience that comes to very few people. Their Majesties were in attendance as was also Princess Margaret, the Queen's Mother and other members of the Royal Family. Queen Mary, the Queen Mother, was a most gracious and charming personality, with so much poise and dignity. Every delegate took advantage of the opportunity to have a few words with her. Princess Elizabeth, as she was then, was not present nor was the Duke of Edinburgh. Two weeks later we learned of the arrival of Prince Charlie, which would seem to explain the reason for the Princess not being at the party. It

was one of those friendly parties where the guests mingled and chatted in complete freedom as they would in a friend's home. My brief word to Her Majesty was to thank her for the gracious message of congratulations Their Majesties sent to my parents on their 67th wedding anniversary.

Visiting Buckingham Palace and meeting members of the Royal Family was a great thrill, and I sensed a desire to have a souvenir, and I got one. It is the two stubs of my hat check, which I have carefully preserved. My friend Wes. Stuart of Charlotte, N.B., fared better. He got an ash tray, and he didn't swipe it.

Having witnessed the opening of Parliament and visited Buckingham Palace, and also having watched the training of horses to be used on the visit of Their Majesties to Canada, I wanted to see the stables, the training school for horses at Buckingham Palace. I finally managed to do so. I was fortunate in having an attendant show me around. I saw the six Scotch Grays and the six Scotch Bays, and found they were not all bred in Scotland. Some of them came from the Continent. They were well bred, well matched, rugged, intelligent looking horses, readily adaptable to harness or saddle, and are trained not to blink an eyelash in traffic jams or when bands burst forth, or guns are fired beside them.

My attendant didn't have the key to the carriage room so I didn't see the carriages. He was the saddle man and invited me to the saddle room. Here were some 20 saddles. They are used for pleasure riding and ceremonial parades with various military units. He showed me the saddle used by His Majesty, the late King George VI, and the one used by Princess Elizabeth. He also showed me the bridles and the bits. It is very important that the proper bridle and bit is used as part of the correct dress for a particular occasion or with the unit on parade when taking part in some function. There was one incident that I thought was so typical of the Englishmen in their intimate and wholesome respect for the Royal Family. When looking at Princess Elizabeth's saddle the attendant said that if I ever saw her riding in the Trooping of the Colours this would be the saddle she was using. Then he added—"You know why she didn't ride this autumn. She is going to have a baby."

One morning I took a taxi to go to Smithfield Market. I had heard a lot of the Smithfield Market and wanted to see the way they handled produce there, and hoped I might find some Canadian bacon and cheese. There was no Canadian produce on the market that day. On the way we passed Buckingham Palace just as they were Changing the Guard. I asked the taxi driver to stop, that I wanted to see this, and went to pay him off. He asked if I would like him to wait, that he might be able to tell me something about it. I readily agreed. I spent three hours with that taxi driver, and they were the most interesting three hours of the entire trip. He told me of all the traditions and history associated with the Changing of the Guard and about Buckingham Palace. Then we drove down Whitehall, past No. 10 Downing St. (the residence of the Prime Minister), and Scotland Yard, past the places where members of the Royal Family lived, and numerous other places of interest. With it all he went into minute detail of the history, the reason, the tradition and the story associated with each place in turn. He told me of when hearing the air-raid siren he left his taxi, and showed me where the bomb struck, just in front of where he had left his cab. It was a most fascinating story of London, its history, custom and tradition, associated as it was with the Royal Family and the Government.

I finally asked him how it was that he was so familiar with the particulars of all he had shown me, and his answer was again so typical of the Englishman. He stated that he had made a bit of a hobby of that sort of thing; that he had once

written a story about it and that someone had sent it to His Majesty, and that after reading it His Majesty had sent for him and complimented him most highly on what he had done. Then someone got hold of him and persuaded him to tell the story over B.B.C. and that it was broadcast to America, and that if I had happened to have heard the story of Buckingham Palace by the London taxicab driver he was the driver. It was a most fascinating experience with a very interesting gentleman.

When our delegation visited Glasgow I played hookey for two days. I wanted to see if I could find any of my family ancestors, and I wanted to visit some Scottish farms. When I looked up the directory, there were about six pages of Weirs, so I gave up looking any further. I did, however, visit three dairy farms owned by the City of Glasgow. The city has some 1700 of the best Ayrshire cows I had ever seen, as well as an equal number of young stock. The barns to house both the cows and the calves were also the best I had ever seen, very clean, well ventilated and well lighted. I was told that the milk was used to supply their institutions, hospitals, etc., and because of this they had to be particularly careful to have it absolutely clean and pure. They also had a number of hogs being raised on the refuse from the hospital, grass, but no grain.

Later I visited the London Dairy Show. This is the senior Dairy Exhibition of the British Isles, where one can see the very best of all breeds of dairy cattle in the Old Country. There were three or four Holstein cows recently imported from Canada, and they showed up very well. There was also some Canadian cheese and Canadian bacon, and while it had not scored first honors it too showed up very well.

At this show the senior award is for what they call their "supreme" class. For this class the representatives of the Breed Associations, usually the secretary, selects two animals from any owner's herd. These cows are milked by special attendants, and the milk weighed and tested. They are judged on their record of performance, on breed type and general conformation. It is really a great class, and brings out the best not only for "show" purposes but for performance as well, and naturally there is great rivalry among the Breed Associations to win this class. There was one milking shorthorn cow that I had picked on in the barn beforehand, and which I was gratified to see come out in this class. It was the finest specimen of a dairy cow I ever expect to see.

The trip gave us an opportunity of seeing a lot of things we had heard a great deal about. London is a great city, the centre of the Commonwealth, and steeped in history and tradition, and it was then just starting to show some evidence of recovery from the terrific bombing it had experienced during the war. We saw St. Paul's Cathedral, Westminster Abbey, Hyde Park, the Guild Hall, the Tower of London, the repository of the Crown Jewels guarded by the Beefeaters, Piccadilly Circus, Petticoat Lane, Madame Tussaud's Wax Works, London Bridge, Buckingham Palace, No. 10 Downing Street, Scotland Yard, the tubes, Cleopatra's Needle, the London Bobby and the London taxicabs. We visited many of their great industries, textiles, engineering, electrical and their great shipyards, including the Austin automobile factory where they make every part of a car under one roof.

The trip through the country took us to Liverpool, Glasgow, Manchester, Edinburgh, Oxford University, Coventry and the Border countries where we saw many old castles and forts. We travelled to Loch Lomond and to Shakespeare's home at Stratford-on-Avon. The most tragic place to me was Coventry, and yet they were starting immediately to repair the shattered ruins. All that remained of their once great Cathedral was the church tower and the basement walls. In walking through it one felt he was walking on hallowed ground.

We were particularly favoured in having dinner in Edinburgh Castle, standing there as it does as a great edifice of Scottish history, and containing within its walls the weapons of wars in days gone by. We made all too short a trip to Paris. We went over by plane and returned the next day by train in response to an urgent request to return to Canada. While there we visited the United Nations Headquarters and saw something of the layout of that great city, as well as having a short look at the City of Versailles.

I had one night in Paris, and not knowing any French nor how to find my way about, I asked Miss McDonald, of Mr. Pearson's staff, to take me in hand. She looked after me very well indeed, and even loaned me 2000 francs to help pay for our evening's entertainment.

In London we managed to see the British Parliament in session, and recognized a number of prominent British statesmen, including Mr. Churchill, Mr. Atlee, Mr. Eden and Mr. Morrison. I paid my respects to the Chief Government Whip and was fortunate in seeing a recorded vote taken in their Parliament.

This all too inadequate recital would not be complete if we neglected to refer to some of the human experiences. In Belgium we had police escort. My friend, L. D. Tremblay, disappeared from us at an evening's entertainment in Brussels, and we never heard of him again for eight days, and then one evening when I was to respond to the toast of welcome at a dinner he just walked in from nowhere. Len also had a very good time at Buckingham Palace. When he awakened the next morning in his hotel he was very much surprised and somewhat concerned to find that his clothes had all been neatly put away, something which he seldom did, but at the same time he couldn't find his wallet or transportation. However, these articles had also been placed in safety. The next day he learned that two British M.P.'s had put him to bed and taken care of him.

We were required to be vaccinated because of our expected return via New York. Len had failed to have this little matter attended to and was a bit reluctant to have it done. However, two days out of New York he had the operation performed by the ship's doctor, and then the next day we were switched to disembark at Halifax, which meant that he did not have to have the vaccination done at all.

We went over on the S.S. "Aquitania" and returned on the S.S. "Britannic," leaving and returning by the port of Halifax. Both ships provided the very finest of accommodation.

The evening we visited Buckingham Palace I also paid a visit to Mr. King who was in London at that time and was indeed very ill. He was, however, kind enough to make a special telephone call to Ottawa on my behalf.

The delegation had been divided, one group visiting Holland and Belgium, and the other West Germany. While in the United Kingdom the party was again divided with one group going to Ireland and Wales and the other group visiting England and Scotland. One small group made a short trip to Greece. My cabin mate both going and coming and also at the Savoy Hotel in London was "Dr." W. Stuart, M.P., of St. Andrews, N.B.

Sir George Foster's Address on Canada

At the time of Queen Victoria's Jubilee in 1896 Sir Wilfrid Laurier had just been elected to office. Sir George Foster was in England and Sir Wilfrid cabled him to represent Canada at the ceremony. The following is Sir George's address on that occasion.

"Yonder looking forth from the broad threshold of the future, stands a form wonderful in beauty, excellent in strength and radiant with cheerful hope. The maple leaf wreathes her brow; on either side crouch the bear and the beaver, and from her shining shoulders falls in graceful folds the flag that for a thousand years has braved the battle and the breeze.

"She speaks, and lo the keen bladed axe gleams in the sunshine, tall pines and giant hemlocks crash to earth, and deep keeled ships glide out from safe moorings to plow the billowy sea.

"Again she speaks, and drill and compressor, pick and shovel are plied with ceaseless energy till from the yawning pits gold and precious metals leap to the surface and ask to be transmuted into force and wealth.

"Once more she speaks, and plow and harrow, sickle and reaper, mellow the rich soil and shear the increase, and the creaking wains bear the harvest home, and the well filled barns laugh with golden plenty.

"Again she speaks and mammoth engines swirl her bounteous produce over ten thousand miles of double shining steel, winds blow and waters flow to drive her vast machinery.

"Again she speaks, and from every hillside and every valley, every city and every hamlet, school doors open wide and merry trooping children with eager feet mount the steps of the temples of knowledge, serve within, and bear in happy noisy groups the precious garnering home again.

"And yet once more on quiet sabbath morn when traffic swirling tide retires before the Holy calm; see on bended knee she drops, and with reverent bowed head and closed eyes she whispers to heaven her faith; 'Our Father's God, in Thee we trust.'

"Who is this, and what is her name, and I answer 'She who gave us birth; she who cradled our infancy and now claims the devotion of our manhood; Canada, land of the shining snow and gleaming sunshine, Daughter in her Mother's house, Mistress in her own'."